

III. Remarks

The Examiner rejected Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112 (second paragraph) as being purportedly indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner pointed out that the term "paper" lacked antecedent basis. As the Examiner will see, Claim 1 has been amended to replace the term "paper" with "fibrous" for which there is antecedent basis. The Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 (second paragraph).

With regard to the objection as to the specification, Applicant has amended each paragraph noted by the Examiner to update the status of the subject patent application except the third paragraph on page 2 which refers to a United States patent application that has not matured into a patent.

With regard to the objection to the drawings, Applicant has amended the last paragraph on page 10 of the specification to provide suitable basis for reference numeral 24 and to correct reference numeral 30 "to read" 20'.

The Examiner rejected Claims 22-45 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being purportedly unpatentable over Claims 1-19 of United States patent 6,171,705 and Claims 1-17 of United States patent 5,985,457. While Applicant traverses this rejection, for the sole purpose of advancing prosecution of the present application, Applicant encloses herewith a Terminal Disclaimer in respect of the patents cited by the Examiner